



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,518	07/09/2001	Naresh Anant Apte	10005654-1	4917

7590 11/05/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/901,518

Applicant(s)

APTE, NARESH ANANT

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/09/2001
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gabber et al(5961593) in view of Spacey(US 20020129279A1) or Micali(6137884).

Regarding claim 1, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose method for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a

Art Unit: 3621

communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 2, Gabber et al (claim 12) show identifiers constructed pseudorandomly which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the transaction limitations of claim 3, Gabber et al (claim 18) show a electronic payment in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the second service provider limitations of claim 4, Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the browser limitations of claims 5, Gabber et al (See Figs. 3 and 4, col. 8, lines 20-35) show a browser employed in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the financial limitations of claims 6, Gabber et al (See Figs. 3 and 4, col. 8, lines 20-35, claim 18) show a browser employed in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the intermediary limitations of claims 7, Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the identity limitations of

Art Unit: 3621

claim 8, Gabber et al (claim 18) show a electronic payment in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the intermediary limitations of claim 9, Gabber et al (claim 18) show a electronic payment in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 10, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose method for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding the intermediary limitations of claims 11, Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 12, Gabber et al (claim 12) show identifiers constructed

Art Unit: 3621

pseudorandomly which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 13, Gabber et al (claim 12) show identifiers constructed pseudorandomly which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because the security of the proxies is enhanced by one time use to increase security by preventing reuse. Regarding the intermediary limitations of claims 14, Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 15, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication.

Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 16, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 ,

Art Unit: 3621

Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 17, Gabber et al (claim 12, col. 7, lines 5-10) show unique and new identifiers constructed pseudorandomly which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 18, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce including a database (Col. 7, lines 35-40) substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed

Art Unit: 3621

that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding the encryption limitations of claim 19, Gabber et al (col. 9, lines 25-30) show DES encryption which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 20, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose method for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional

Art Unit: 3621

equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding claim 21, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose method for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. It would further be obvious to charge a fee for these services. Regarding claim 22, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce including a database (Col. 7, lines 35-40) substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous

Art Unit: 3621

proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. It would further be obvious to charge a fee for these services. Regarding claim 23, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce including a database (Col. 7, lines 35-40) substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. It would

Art Unit: 3621

further be obvious to charge a fee for these services. Regarding claim 24, Gabber et al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means including a computer medium(see Col. 4, lines10-25) for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce including a database (Col. 7, lines 35-40) substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding the transaction limitations of claim 25, Gabber et al (claim 18) show a electronic payment in anonymous commerce which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the second service provider limitations of claim 26, Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding computer medium claims 27-32, Gabber et

Art Unit: 3621

al (See abstract, Figs. 2,5,6 , Col. 3, lines 1-10, 50-65, Col. 4, lines 10-25, Col. 5, lines 15-65, col. 7, lines 5-55 claims 12 and 18) disclose means including a computer medium(see Col. 4, lines10-25) for network communication employing transactions with anonymous commerce including a database (Col. 7, lines 35-40) substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an intermediary for temporary fictitious identities. It is noted that it is believed that the anonymous proxies are functionally equivalent to temporary fictitious identities. Spacey(See Fig. 3,) show an intermediary for ensuring the anonymity of a communication. Micali(See Col. 9, lines 20-35) show the hiding of identities in a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Gabber et al because the use of intermediaries are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Serial Number: 09/901,518

12

Art Unit: 3621

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks


Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park
V, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Seventh
Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of
this application or proceeding should be directed to the
Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) **308-4177**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be
obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR)
system. Status information for published applications may be
obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,
see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on
access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222